

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Blair BIRMINGHAM

Title: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR USING MULTIPLE OPERATING
SYSTEMS

App. No.: 09/675,033

Filed: September 28, 2000

Examiner: Haresh N. PATEL

Group Art Unit: 2154

Atty. Dkt. No.: 1376-0000900

Confirmation No.: 7656

Mail Stop AMENDMENT
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL WITH INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Dear Commissioner:

In order to comply more fully with 37 C.F.R. § 1.56, as currently construed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, Applicants are providing further information regarding the related patent applications to this matter. Attached hereto, along with the Information Disclosure Statement Form PTO/SB/08a, is a list of actions for a related application for the patent application referenced above, entitled "Actions on the Merits by the U.S.P.T.O."

The information on the list includes the related application and its filing date, type of action, date of action, and substantive actions taken by the U.S.P.T.O. regarding the claims. The substantive actions include rejections, notices of allowance, and issuance. The rejections include not only statutory rejections, but also include non-statutory rejections (e.g., obviousness-type double patenting rejections). Other actions by the U.S.P.T.O. do not appear in the listing, as these would be less likely to provide a basis for rejecting a claim in a different patent application. As one example, if an office action only includes a restriction requirement, it is not listed. Also, the list does not include objections (e.g., drawing objections, specification objections, etc.).

The list of actions for the related patent application should be reasonably up to date. However, Applicants note that correspondence from the U.S.P.T.O. may have been mailed and not yet received at the correspondence address when this paper is received by the U.S.P.T.O.

Thus, the Examiner is requested to review the patent application listed to determine if recent actions have not yet made the list.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to review the related patent application for rejections to determine whether references and other information cited in the related patent application would be relevant to any or all claims in the Present Application. If the patent application in the list properly qualifies as prior art with respect to the Present Application, Applicants also respectfully request the Examiner to review such proper prior-art patent application for relevancy with respect to any or all claims in the Present Application. Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner to examine allowed and issued claims in the related patent application for double patenting issues with respect to any or all claims in the Present Application. To the extent the patent application can be used for any other reason not listed, the Examiner is encouraged to use the patent application in any manner that allows the Examiner to make a more informed decision regarding the Present Application, including its claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the Present Application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the Present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

June 19, 2008

Date

/Adam D. Sheehan/

Adam D. Sheehan, Reg. No. 42,146

LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP

5914 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 200

Austin, Texas 78730

(512) 439-7100 (phone)

(512) 327-5452 (fax)